



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,663	10/29/2003	Michael G. Christofalo	043978-074000	4069
22204	7590	06/09/2008	EXAMINER	
NIXON PEABODY, LLP			SMITH, CHENEA	
401 9TH STREET, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 900			2623	
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/09/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/695,663

**Examiner**

CHENEA P. SMITH

**Applicant(s)**

CHRISTOFALO ET AL.

**Art Unit**

2623

**—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —**

THE REPLY FILED **13 May 2008** FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
 See notes below.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

/Christopher Grant/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive

Regarding applicant's arguments on page 8, lines 1-21, Safadi does not disclose a digital splicer that receives a message from an ad server...[or] a digital splicer that extracts an attached command from a message". Applicants should note that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Safadi discloses a digital ad server which generates ad content (ad server 150, see Fig. 1 and col 5, lines 14-16), and a digital splicer (encoder/mux 120, see Fig. 3) which receives a message (protocol message, see col 8, lines 10-15), the message being separate from generated ad content (the message must be separate from the ad content since either the ad or the cue command may be inserted, see col 5, lines 53-57), extracts the attached command (the cue command of Safadi col 8, lines 29-30 must be extracted from the protocol message of Safadi col 8, lines 11-15 since the cue command is inserted into the bit stream, (see col 8, lines 25-34) and splices the command into a digital transport stream (see col 8, lines 29-34) including program content (see col 4, lines 46-53), the command being inserted separately from the program content in the digital transport stream (the program content is put into the transport stream first, see col 4, lines 46-55, and then the command is inserted, see col 8, lines 10-15 and col 7, lines 66-67, i.e., the command being inserted separately from the program content in the digital transport stream).  
Safadi's encoder/mux reads on the limitations of Applicant's digital splicer given that claimed limitations are given their broadest reasonable interpretations.

Safadi does not specifically disclose an ad server generating ad content and a message being separate from generated ad content. In an analogous art, Ridderheim discloses ad server (central broadcast station 2, see Fig. 1) generating ad content (see col 7, line 65 – col 8, line 8), and a message being separate from generated ad content (see col 10, lines 39-43).

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Safadi's system to include ad server generating ad content and a message being separate from generated ad content, as disclosed by Ridderheim, for the advantage of allowing the message to be sent at a time different from the ad content, while preserving frame accuracy.